

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Applicants' Related Art.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Specification is objected to for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

The Drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 1 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-8 are pending for consideration.

Drawing Objection

The Drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the features of claim 5, i.e., "a passivation film is applied as the intermediate film," is not shown in the Drawings. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action has taken the features recited by claim 5 completely out of context. Specifically, claim 5, as reproduced below, recites a combination of features including:

"The panel according to claim 1, wherein a triple-film formed by stacking a gate insulation film, a semiconductor layer, and a passivation film is applied as the intermediate film."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully asserts claim 5, in entirety, does not simply recite "a passivation film is applied as the intermediate film," but requires the gate insulating film,

semiconductor layer, and passivation film. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that FIG. 6 clearly shows the structure recited by claim 5, including the gate insulating film 420, the semiconductor layer 430, and the passivation film 440 to form a triple-film, all of which are to be applied as an intermediate film.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the Drawings clearly show all the features of claim 5, and respectfully request that the objection to the Drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

In the event that Applicants' explanation above is not deemed to overcome the objection to the Drawings, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact Applicants' undersigned representative in order to advance prosecution of the application.

Specification Objection

The Specification is objected to for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. For reasons similar to those presented above with regard to the Drawing objection, Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action has taken the features recited by claim 5 completely out of context. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the Specification clearly provides proper antecedent basis for the combination of features recited by claim 5.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the Specification clearly provides proper antecedent basis for the combination of features recited by claim 5, and respectfully request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

In the event that Applicants' explanation above is not deemed to overcome the objection to the Specification, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact Applicants' undersigned representative in order to advance prosecution of the application.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. For reasons similar to those presented above with regard to the Drawing and Specification objections, Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action has taken the features recited by claim 5 completely out of context. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of features recited by claim 5 is completely and sufficiently described in the Specification to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would know to read the entire claim in order to establish that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention as the time the application was filed.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that all claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In the event that Applicants' explanation above is not deemed to overcome the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact Applicants' undersigned representative in order to advance prosecution of the application.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Applicants' Related Art. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on grounds that Applicants' Related Art fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-8.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display panel including, in part, "at least one conductive line at a corner portion of the first substrate, the conductive line connecting the controller and the gate drivers," and "a plurality of transparent electrodes overlapping the conductive line with at least one intermediate film interposed therebetween, each transparent electrode including a plurality of transparent electrode segments isolated from each other" (emphasis added). In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, any one of the conductive lines 111A-C shown in Applicants' Related Art FIGs. 1-4 fails to include a plurality of transparent electrodes overlapping the conductive line with at least one intermediate film interposed therebetween" wherein "each transparent electrode including a plurality of transparent electrode segments isolated from each other," as required by amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that none of Applicants' Related Art FIGs. 1-4 teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-8.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____


David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: September 20, 2006

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000